

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 and 7-17 are pending in the application.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3, 7-11 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ittycheriah et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,530) in view of Lin et al. (U.S. Patent Publication NO. 2002/0049848). Claims 12-13 were rejected under 36 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ittycheriah in view of Besling et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,348).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 7-11 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ittycheriah et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,530) in view of Lin et al. (U.S. Patent Publication NO. 2002/0049848). Claims 12-13 were rejected under 36 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ittycheriah in view of Besling et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,348).

Independent claim 1 of the present application recites a method for at least one of generating and expanding a vocabulary database of a speech recognition system including “providing the audio module with vocabulary data in a streaming mode from a telecommunication network” and “speaking the vocabulary data to the speech recognition system in an automated manner using the audio module so as to expand the vocabulary database.”

It is respectfully submitted that Ittycheriah and Lin, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the above recited features of claim 1. Specifically, as the office action acknowledges, Ittycheriah does not disclose providing the audio module with vocabulary data in a streaming mode from a telecommunication network. See Office Action pg. 3. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that Ittycheriah does not disclose or suggest speaking the vocabulary data to the speech recognition system in an *automated manner* using the audio module so as to expand the vocabulary database. In contrast, Ittycheriah merely describes a speech utterance pre-processor receiving speech *uttered by a speaker*. See, e.g., Ittycheriah Col. 4, ll. 16-25.

Ittycheriah nowhere discloses speaking the vocabulary data to the speech recognition system in an automated manner, as required by claim 1.

Lin fails to make up for the deficiencies of Ittycheriah. In contrast, Lin merely describes updating a user file based on areas of interest. See, e.g., Lin ¶¶ 20 – 21. Lin nowhere discloses or suggests providing the audio module in a streaming mode from a telecommunication network, with vocabulary data that is spoken to a speech recognition system, as required by claim 1. Nor does Lin disclose or suggest speaking the vocabulary data to the speech recognition system in an automated manner using the audio module so as to expand the vocabulary database, as required by claim 1.

Nor does Besling make up for the deficiencies of the combo of claims 1 and 2.

Because none of Ittycheriah, Lin, or Besling disclose or suggest all of the above-recited features of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that any combination of Ittycheriah, Lin, and Besling to the extent proper, could not render independent claim 1 or any of its dependent claims 3, 7-15 obvious for at least the reasons discussed above.

Independent claim 16 recites similar features as those of independent claim 1. For the reasons stated above, neither Ittycheriah nor Lin disclose or suggest all of the above-recited features of claim 16. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ittycheriah and Lin, to the extent proper, could not render independent claim 16 or its dependent claim 17 obvious for at least the reasons discussed above.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the respective rejection of claims 1, 3 and 7-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on respective combinations of Ittycheriah, Lin and Besling is respectively requested.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 12-1216.

Respectfully submitted,



Erik R. Swanson, Reg. No. 40,833
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Liebigstrasse 51
60323 Frankfurt am Main
Germany DE
+40(0)69 713 7798-0 (telephone)
+49(0)69 713 7798-29 (facsimile)

Date: October 6, 2010